

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

VOL. XIX, No. 10

BULLETIN

DECEMBER, 1940

Co-ordination Between Private and Public Children's Agencies

INEZ M. BAKER

Child Welfare Consultant, Department of Public Welfare, New Orleans, La.

PERHAPS in no field of social work is the need for co-ordination of effort so great as in the children's field. The demand for adequate services has always exceeded the available supply. It, therefore, becomes the clear responsibility of all child welfare workers to examine carefully the child welfare needs of their respective communities in relationship to the available resources and to direct their efforts toward a co-ordination of these resources which will insure the best possible service to children within that community. This implies a knowledge and understanding of the needs, the resources, and the community.

The co-ordination of private and public agencies would be enormously simplified if there were a clear-cut pattern to follow. However, the many complexities and variables inherent within different communities eliminate such a possibility. The varying degrees of skill on the part of those doing the job, the community's pattern of care for children, the degree to which the community has accepted its responsibility, the past basis for distributing the job between public and private agencies, and the extent to which agencies have evaluated their programs are only a few of the factors to be taken into consideration. However, in every community program for children, the child is the common denominator and is the only excuse for the existence of any children's agency. His needs are the same whether he is in the care of a private or public agency. Perhaps, by thinking in terms of the total community program for children, more progress can be made toward adapting agency programs to the needs of the children involved.

The revamping of programs is often difficult, particularly when it means departure from past practice. There is a fear that the agency's position is threatened by giving up any of its former functions. The fear is not only in loss of status but also the fear of increased difficulty in financing. Frequently private agencies are fearful of entrusting the job of child care to public hands on the basis that the quality of case

work services will suffer. Undoubtedly there has been some justification for this fear. Nevertheless, the best interests of the total community program demand that private agencies lend their strength, their experience in child care and their confidence to the public group, at the same time insisting upon the maintenance of high standards of service. On the other hand, we find public agencies sometimes guilty of seeking defense in their legal restrictions, hiding behind the screen of "volume of work," or adapting the attitude "let the private agency do that part of the job not forced upon us by law." There are justifications and explanations for all of the various attitudes we find on the part of private and public agencies. It is true that public agencies are to some extent limited by law in what they can and cannot do. However, they can strive for liberal interpretations, and they can show a willingness to accept responsibility. If agencies, private and public, can scrap their defensive attitudes and can see themselves as a changing and developing part of the total program rather than as an isolated institution, protective agency, or child placing agency, they will more positively serve the community. They will be better able to change or modify their particular programs to the best interests of the community program, whether it means assuming more or less responsibility, taking on new functions or giving up old ones.

It is generally accepted that public agencies cannot go far beyond or lag far behind the level of public understanding, either in the extent or the quality of services rendered. It is frequently said that private agencies are more flexible than public agencies. They have "fewer strings tied to their funds." As voluntary agencies, they can pick up where the public agencies leave off. These concepts though generally true imply an oversimplification of the problem.

Children's agencies are frequently complicated by factors in their own organizations. Many have charters and endowments which commit them to be a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC & SOCIAL ADMINISTRATION
LIBRARY
40 E. FERRY AVENUE
DETROIT, MICHIGAN

specified type of service. The issue is further beclouded by the wide-spread prevalence of subsidies. However, most agencies which have seriously attempted to revise their programs have found a way around charters and endowments which restricted their developments along progressive lines. The subsidy system seems to have had its beginning because the public was unwilling to assume responsibility, it seemed cheaper than providing adequate public care, and was thought to carry less stigma for the child. Doubtlessly, large subsidized agencies and institutions have retarded the development of adequate public services. Since the subsidy system is of such long standing and is popular with influential groups, there is little indication that the practice will or should be discontinued in the near future. However, it makes for difficulty in clarifying public and private responsibility and deserves serious thought on the part of those concerned with the total community program for children.

The most common basis for dividing up the job of child care seems to be on functional basis or in terms of long and short time care. It is generally thought that the large groups of dependent and delinquent children who require long time care should be public responsibility, while the private agencies should devote their efforts to children requiring short time care, or in need of more specialized services than are usually available in public agencies. However, there are many considerations in accepting an arbitrary division. First, who is to decide if care is on long or short time basis? Certainly in many cases this decision cannot be made conclusively on the basis of an intake interview or a social study. Again, there is necessarily no relationship between the type of care best suited to the child's needs, and whether or not he will require long or short time care.

In such a distribution, there is the danger of fitting the child to the policy rather than adapting the policy to the needs of the child. For example, a child is accepted for care by an agency whose policy is to provide short time care. It develops that a more permanent plan is indicated. There is a temptation to transfer him to the agency committed to giving long time care without sufficient consideration of *what another uprooting will mean to him* and whether or not the new experience will be constructive. Any division on the basis of dependency, delinquency or neglect is equally difficult. As we gain a better understanding of behavior, the lines of distinction grow more dim.

There are inherent dangers in segregation of children on the basis of problem. We are likely to see the

problem instead of the total child. Likewise, we treat the problem instead of the child. It is no more absurd to assume that there is one cause for all delinquency than to assume that one type of care is suited to all delinquents. Yet we find the wide-spread practice of segregation of so-called "delinquents" solely on the basis of problem with little regard as to whether or not the program for delinquents has any constructive value for the child in question.

In some communities, programs have developed along highly specialized lines. Although the advantages of specialization are obvious, there is a point beyond which the danger of programs becoming crystallized is eminent. Where intake is contingent upon age, sex, religion, economic status, mentality, problem presented, with or without health problem, etc., it is too often difficult to find any agency that can accept the child who needs help. And so there seems to be no entirely satisfactory way of dividing up the job of child care between private and public agencies, at the same time keeping the responsibilities sorted out in a clearly defined fashion.

In general, it seems reasonable, in looking toward the future, to expect the public agencies to provide care for the larger number of children. It would also seem that private agencies can make the greatest contribution by emphasizing quality of service, by stimulating interest through demonstrations in the fields of special needs, and by experimenting in new methods of care. By virtue of their experience as leaders in child care, they are in a more secure position to experiment and make suggestions in regard to care of all children. Here again the private and public groups must each be in close contact with the activities of the other. If the public agencies carry the numbers, the private agencies must be aware of trends in those numbers if their specialties, experiments and demonstrations are to fill the fullest usefulness in the total community program.

One of the guiding principles to be kept in mind in the co-ordination of any community program for children is flexibility. Agency policies should be elastic enough that they include the children who need help. The policies should also be flexible to the point that change in policy is possible with changing circumstances and growth in the community program. Perhaps, by thinking in terms of the child, agencies can best achieve this flexibility so essential to their usefulness. Since the needs of children vary from time to time, there must be provision for an easy flow between agencies. Too frequently we find the practice and attitude prevailing among agencies that the child is the responsibility of the agency which

originally accepted him. Although the child is unable to use constructively the program the agency has to offer, other agencies better equipped to meet his needs are sometimes unwilling to relieve the original agency of the responsibility it assumed in accepting him. It is the child who suffers, and his best interests are recognized only if there is flexibility, a give and take among agencies, each as a component part of the total program. We see the necessity of fitting the program to the child instead of regimenting the child according to agency policy.

In emphasizing the necessity for a co-ordinated and unified approach to the job of child care, it is recognized that there are no rules, mechanics, or new tricks whereby it can be achieved. However, we might consider a better use of several of the tools we have—namely, boards, committees and staffs with particular reference to more effective interpretation.

Would a different emphasis in the interpretation of child welfare be helpful? If interpretation could deal *more* with the community program and its needs and *less* with agency programs and needs, it might be a step toward focusing on the total community program for children.

In scanning agency practices, we find a strong tendency for executives to determine policies. It seems to me that much could be gained through greater participation of staffs and boards. I believe there is a tendency to overlook and underestimate the contribution each has to offer. Case workers more often than anyone else are called upon to explain the agency policies, yet it is frequently con-

sidered sufficient if they can state and apply the policies of the agency. In this connection, there are two things that seem to me appalling: First, how little case workers, in general, know of the programs of other agencies as well as the thinking that has gone into determining their own agency's policies, and secondly the frequency with which the constructive thinking and ideas of case workers are not solicited or even given opportunity for expression. It seems to me that case workers have a place of greatest importance in an effective co-ordination of child welfare activities. However, they cannot interpret community needs or community resources unless they understand them. Perhaps one way of obtaining the interplay and exchange of ideas so essential to a better understanding of the community program is through wider use of committees which include representation from case work staffs and boards of various agencies.

We seek assistance from the fields of psychology, psychiatry, medicine and education in an effort to give the child opportunity for physical, mental, and emotional growth. As we become more understanding of him and his needs we become more dependent upon other sources to supply much that must go into the making of an adequate individual. And so, as child welfare workers and agencies, the time has long passed when it is possible to isolate ourselves and perform an adequate service without concern, knowledge and participation in all that is going on about us. We have a serious responsibility and trust which reaches out to include all children who need our help.

Comments by Bessie E. Trout, Welfare Training Assistant, Department of Social Welfare, Albany

By bringing before us the problems that so frequently interfere with the co-ordination of the public and private child welfare agencies, this paper stimulates us to re-think the issues involved. In considering the problems as presented here, it seems that they might be further clarified if emphasis were placed on the fact that the legal responsibility for providing services to children who are in need rests with the public child welfare agency. It is true that the public agency has not completely fulfilled its responsibility. The development of its services has varied and has been influenced by the already existing resources and the leadership in each community. Progress in the direction of fulfilling public responsibility has been seen in the recent developments of public child welfare services in rural areas which have developed under the stimulation and assistance made possible by federal grants to the states under the Social Security Act. Here too is illustration of the fact that the legal framework of a public agency does not in itself interfere with the quality of its services. Is it not true that the various state child welfare laws do permit the public child welfare agencies to carry out a broad program of services to children to include both social services to children living with their own families and

foster care services? Where restrictions of practice do exist, are they not primarily based on a lack of liberal interpretation of the law rather than on the need for change in legislation?

The private agency, unlike the public agency, has no legal obligations and is free to develop whatever services it chooses. Since these services have been based largely on the need to supplement (not supplant) the public agency and, therefore, have been of the nature of demonstrations or experimentation, the private agency has been faced with constant need to shift and change the emphasis of its programs as the public agency has been able to develop its services.

An obligation rests on public and private agencies alike to see that services are available to children in need, and each agency has its part to play in carrying out this responsibility. Is not the approach to the solution of these problems one of mutual understanding of each other's services? Is it not a matter of both the public and the private agencies understanding to what extent the public agency at a given time is able to fulfill its responsibilities, and where the private agency's services are needed to bring about a well-rounded child welfare program in the community?

BULLETIN

Published monthly (omitted in July and August) as the official organ of the Child Welfare League of America.

The Bulletin is in large measure a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

Annual subscription, \$1.00

Single copies, 10c.

Checks payable to Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

Is This a Merry Christmas?

WHETHER we be in Canada or the United States, it may seem difficult this year to say, "Merry Christmas!" But with all that may depress men and women there remains in the spirits of children the love and faith of which the spirit of Christmas is made.

Many a home in Europe and the Orient has no walls within which a holiday may be celebrated and many a child will miss one or both of the parents who brought Christmas cheer in 1939. The life of Jesus was far from comfortable, and one of the gifts brought to Bethlehem was myrrh—signifying death. Like many refugees of our own day, His parents fled with the child to another country.

But from such a clouded background came a powerful leader of a great religion. Whether we be Christians or of another faith, there comes this inspiration—that from times as bad or worse than ours, courage and a friendly way of life emerged. So from children surviving this Christmas, we may hope for the leaders so sorely needed.

We who serve lonely children, often sharing with them great disappointment, still have frequent reminders of the happiness they can find even under dismal conditions. The very acceptance of a foster parent by a child calls for faith as well as affection. Such acts of children may show us the way to the better life for which the world now yearns. It is little enough for us to keep our own courage sufficient to nourish theirs and to help them discover true happiness.

Hate, born of suspicion and fear, leads only into the dark. But a young child cannot hate. So in all our efforts we can have hope for a better world. It is with a child in our thoughts then that we can look into the future and say, "Merry Christmas!"

—HOWARD W. HOPKIRK

Case Recording of Child Welfare Services

During the past two years a committee composed of staff members of state welfare departments engaged in developing public child welfare services in local units of government has been studying case recording with special reference to the needs of rural areas. Discussion and experimentation have centered around the thought that good case recording grows out of recognition of good case-work practice, and that it operates to improve case treatment. Analysis of actual case records and group discussions by county child welfare workers have clarified the deliberations of the committee and have assured consideration of the practicability as well as the social theory of its proposals. The committee report will be completed within the next two or three months.*

The "Committee on Case Recording in Public Child-Welfare Agencies in Rural Areas" was appointed by the director of the Child Welfare Division of the United States Children's Bureau in response to a request made at a conference of workers administering State and local child welfare services under the provisions of the Social Security Act. The committee therefore approached its task from the point of view of child welfare services needed in rural communities and practical problems confronting workers in such areas. The case record has been considered as a fundamental part of the case treatment process, and each step of recording has been discussed in the light of the objectives of adequate social service.

The definitions of public responsibility for social services to children which were later adopted by the White House Conference on Children in a Democracy were accepted as the basis for case treatment and consequent recording: "Public child-welfare services should be available to every child in need of such help. . . . There should be no question of eligibility for service based on . . . any consideration other than the child's need. . . . Every child who comes to the attention of a public-welfare agency should be given whatever service he requires. . . . The responsibility of the agency should continue as long as the child is in need of services. . . . Foster care should be utilized only after due consideration has been given to the possibility of maintaining the child in his own home under proper conditions. When care in a foster-family home or institution is found to

* Miss Bessie E. Trout, chairman of the committee, presented a paper on "Criteria for Case Recording in a Public Welfare Agency," at a meeting of the Child Welfare League of America at Grand Rapids, May 31, 1940. A copy of this paper can be obtained by writing to Miss Trout or from the United States Children's Bureau.

be desirable it should be accompanied by work for the rehabilitation of the home, unless the child's welfare necessitates permanent severance of family ties. . . Foster care in a family home or institution should be preceded by social service to determine whether such care will be to the child's best interest, and the type of care which best suits his needs."

This approach to the problem of case recording in rural areas was made possible by developments of the past few years in the field of public social services for children. Through funds made available by the Federal Social Security Act approximately 800 counties or other rural areas have had the services of child welfare workers for varying periods of time. As of October 1, 1939, the salaries of 652 child welfare workers on the staffs of State or local welfare departments were paid in full or in part from Federal funds. Of these workers, 555 were college graduates; 466 had attended a school of social work for from a few months to a year or more; and 466 had had case work experience either in child or family welfare; a large number had received special child-welfare training following their employment by the public agency.

The interest shown in the work of the committee is ample evidence that there will be practical application of its recommendations, not only in the rural areas in which child welfare services have been developed with the aid of Federal funds authorized by the Social Security Act—the primary purpose of the committee's activities—but also in the wider field of child welfare work. Social services for children will rise to the level of the staff provided for such services, whether in the public or the private field, in rural or in urban areas.

—EMMA O. LUNDBERG

*Assistant Director, Child Welfare Division,
United States Children's Bureau*

Gratitude Due Our Guests

Another interpretation of the significance of American Service to European children appeared in an editorial in the *New York Herald-Tribune* of December 7, 1940, which is enclosed with this BULLETIN. It reads as follows:

"The Child Welfare League of America has been working on this problem of establishing standards for child care and placement for twenty years . . . The arrival of the foreign children, first calling attention to our defects and then quickening interest in improving our methods, has given impetus to the work of the League, such as years of less dramatized and publicized effort did not give."

Values in Merit System Examinations

Several executives of members of the League have been asked to assist in one way or another in preparing or conducting Merit System examinations. It is an arduous and sometimes thankless task. But it is just such participation as will give some of the best for which the League stands to the rapidly developing public services for children.

Even though the time budget has been overcrowded by other demands, a request that you assist with these examinations may present an opportunity to register for standards in children's work. If there be oil to burn in the lamp, this may be just the time when the representatives of good service should do some after-dinner "home work" and in so doing help the government and the children it serves.

READERS' FORUM

DEAR EDITOR:

Miss Lillian J. Johnson's paper on "Value of Case Work Service to the Child in the Institution" (September BULLETIN) was of special interest to us because for the past three years we have attempted to give such "therapeutic case work service" to some of the children at the New Haven Children's Center by combining the positions of housefather of the older boys' cottage with that of a social worker. As all our boys attend public schools and are away during the greater part of the day, the housefather is able to fill a half-time case work position, serving all the boys in the adolescent cottage as well as supervising a number of boys in foster homes and in their own homes.

Although this is the first time that we have experimented with such a combination of institutional and case work responsibilities, we feel that it has worked out quite well. A person carrying the responsibility for case work planning as well as for institutional treatment can gain more insight into the children's problems and should be well equipped to do constructive work. The relationship of such a case worker-housefather to the children in the institution enables him to interpret their behavior problems to their families, and on the other hand the knowledge of the home conditions makes it easier for him to interpret their difficulties to the other members of the institutional staff (housemother, recreation director, etc.).

The only danger which might arise in this set-up is the possibility of a boy's feeling of resentment to live with a person who "knows too much" about his family or about his past. At the Center, however, these boys seem to form a closer relationship to the housemother or to the assistant and we do not feel that this problem is too dangerous. Undoubtedly it can promote better understanding and closer cooperation between the social service department and the institutional workers.

Very truly yours,

BYRON T. HACKER

Executive Director, Children's Center, New Haven, Conn.

Readers are urged to send in comments, replies, and other questions.

THE BOARD MEMBER SPEAKS—

A Board Member's Rôle in a Changing World

A board member's area of service in the child care field can be divided roughly into two parts. He can participate in the work of public or private agencies. So large a part of the responsibility for the care of dependent children now falls to the various state, county or municipal departments of welfare that it might seem as if the board member part in the picture was to be greatly decreased. However, throughout the country public officials have seen the need of lay assistance in setting up their departments.

The functions of these groups vary with the legal set-up of the public departments. In some areas they have specific powers of administration. In others they serve as an advisory group. Between these limits there are different degrees of board member responsibility. The rôle of the board member in this quasi-public relationship is exceedingly challenging. On the caliber of his group depend the type of program, the quality of the work and its place in the scheme of public assistance. He should bring to his position an inclusive experience in the child care field and should supplement this with constant study. By becoming a board member of a public organization he has assumed responsibility for wide potential influence.

A board member of a voluntary child care agency can have a constructive job providing, of course, that he is conscientious and intelligent in his approach to his responsibilities. The board member must be eager to devote time and energy to developing his rôle. For I can think of no field of endeavor more dependent on the ratio of time and interest to actual accomplishment. There is no set of rules or regulations for the lay board member; no hours of work; no standard of performance by which he can measure his achievement. It is indeed an undefined area of service which can mean little or nothing if the board member himself does not set his own horizons and limitations and use his own initiative and give meaning and substance to his job.

The days when a well-meaning board member of a private agency actually participated in the professional area is over. No longer does that earnest man or woman gratify his urge to be helpful by directly guiding the life of the children entrusted for care. He realizes that technical skills are necessary to handle problems connected with child care and that his job lies in giving support to enlightened methods of procedure under the guidance of a competent staff. He carries responsibility for evaluating the agency pro-

gram in terms of the needs of the community. He supports his executive staff in its contribution to the child care field and at the same time inspires revision of program where indicated. Support of his agency program plus interest in progressive planning call for more than attending board meetings and giving rubber stamp approval to executive philosophy and performance. It means establishing community contacts, acquiring knowledge of new trends and needs, oriented to agency set-up.

Besides his duties of self-education and consequent influence on his fellow board members and staff there are specific jobs in the agency, even though they are not directly with children. One of the most important of these functions is stimulating financial support. This is certainly an accepted board member responsibility, but can become very sterile if not linked with actual performance. With new procedures of fund raising, such as those sponsored by community chests and public subsidies, a board member is frequently relieved of part of this burden and has more time for concern with policies of the agency, personnel problems, and the mechanical functions of an integrated organization.

There are frequently angles of child care which derive a definite impetus from board member interest: The maintenance of a satisfactory health program, the purchase of necessary supplies, making contacts for increased vacation facilities, the stimulation of vocational education and employment opportunities. Every agency should seek to broaden its scope and explore new procedures. Board member leadership is necessary in sponsoring such projects and interpreting them to the public. These functions can be challenging to the board member. They fall into three categories: Direction, fund-raising, and personal participation. Each or all of these three areas of service can become an enriching experience for the board member and be constructive to the agency.

In both public and private fields it is increasingly apparent that a board member plays an important part. He has the opportunity to be a positive factor in the community. This is no static job, but will vary constantly with individual capacities. The board member's rôle will become increasingly important if he can bring to it a dynamic interest and a pioneer spirit which will encourage constructive efforts to maintain standards of care and stimulate progressive thinking and planning for the future.

MRS. RICHARD J. BERNHARD
Chairman, Foster Home Bureau, New York
Association for Jewish Children

The League's Information Service Calls For Help

THE Information Service has been receiving an average of about 50 letters a month. These ask for information and advice on practices in the field of child welfare which, if enumerated, would serve to define the scope of the field. Here is a very bare sampling of questions. They do not purport to indicate all major interests.

1. What are the trends in foster care in relation to interpretation to community and board, of the agency's function or purpose?
2. How are the place of the institution, cottage and congregate and the place of foster home care differentiated?
3. What is the experience and practice in relation to infant foster care?
4. What experiences can we draw from as to the best way to get foster homes?
5. What can you tell us about personnel practices in our field, including vacation, study leave, in service training opportunities?
6. Will you refer us to an institution that has a good case work service for parents and children?
7. What child care agencies have developed an adequate staff evaluation process—can you give us such material?
8. Can you tell us about case work practices in a child care agency that does protective work too?
9. Have you records of case work at intake, placement, discharge, work with adolescents, etc.; included is every phase of the job?
10. How do board and staff work together in re-evaluating the uses of the service?

While the League can supply answers to such questions and many others from its experience and from its files of information, we do need enrichment of our source of knowledge about current and progressive practice from the experiences of your agency. What special interests has your staff had? What special investigations, discussions, committee or study groups have been active? The Department of Information and Publications invites you to pool your thinking and planning. Enrich the reservoir of service to the child welfare field through contributions from the experience and practice of your agency.

Available for Circulation

First Interviews with a Prospective Foster Mother, The Family, December, 1940.

Quiz for Board and their Members, Board Member and Social Worker, Survey Midmonthly, November, 1940.

BOOK NOTES

THE YOUTH OF NEW YORK CITY: Nettie Pauline McGill and Ellen Nathalie Matthews. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1940.

Those who serve and counsel intimately with youth will find corroboration of many familiar facts concerning the problems of young people. The general public, officials and leaders upon whom responsibility for the education and welfare of our youth falls will discover a disturbing picture in the array of problems confronting our present generation of youth as presented in clear and competent manner in "The Youth of New York City," by Nettie Pauline McGill and Ellen Nathalie Matthews, of the staff of the Research Bureau, Welfare Council of New York City.

Interviews with approximately 10,000 young persons 16 to 25 years of age selected from all social and economic groups in all parts of the city reveal facts concerning health, housing, education, lack of employment, and lack of opportunity for social development and recreation among this age group which demand public attention and the serious thought of all who are in positions of responsibility and leadership.

The study indicates there are more than 50,000 youth 16 to 25 years of age handicapped by chronic illness, not including youth in hospitals, sanitariums and institutions. About one-third of the youth come from homes where the family income is less than \$1,000 per year, and about 15% were on relief or their families were on relief. Marriage was deferred by 32% of the young men interviewed and by 21% of the young women, thus creating possibilities of serious problems of social adjustment.

Despite greatly increased gains in attendance at school and college, only one-fifth of the group between 16 and 24 years of age were attending full time school or college. Although great sums of money are spent on vocational education, relatively few young persons used their specific training nor did their vocational training appear to make much difference in getting or keeping a job. There was a decline in apprenticeship training in the United States during the depression until there is now an actual shortage of skilled workers in certain trades. Thousands of our youth have left school during the past decade of depression and have no work experience. In 1935 more than one-third of young men and women in New York City seeking employment were totally inexperienced, though many of them were equipped with the best the schools had to give.

As to how youth uses leisure time, the study shows that as far as self-improvement goes, only one in ten unemployed boys and girls were attending part time

classes, taking part time courses, studying music, art, literature or systematically "improving their time." The study suggests what might be included in a balanced ration of leisure time.

Like all large studies, "The Youth of New York City" cost a considerable sum of money and it is to be hoped that it will be wisely used to the fullest advantage. Only when such studies are requested by and fully participated in by all public and private agencies and individuals concerned with the problem studied and then followed up after its completion, can it be considered a wise investment of money.

—ROY E. GILSON

Supervisor of City Branches, The Children's Aid Society

CHILD CARE AND TRAINING: Marion L. Faegre and John E. Anderson. Revised Edition, 320 pp. University of Minnesota Press. 1940.

WE, THE PARENTS: Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg. 296 pp. Harper Bros. 1940.

LET'S TALK ABOUT YOUR BABY: Dr. H. Kent Tenney, Jr. 115 pp. University of Minnesota Press. 1940.

Sense and essentials characterize this distinguished threesome, each of which deals, in its individual way, with how to make a child well and happy.

The Faegre and Anderson book, now in its fifth edition, is a richly detailed, but crystal-clear, course in the care and training of the child from his first days through his adolescence. It is quickened by an understanding of the child from which even the uninitiated will not hold aloof, for the child's emotions, thoughts, steps in learning are explained in such simple, reasonable terms.

The authors have a gift for being specific, which greatly enhances the value of the book. Not content to say, for example, that poor food habits are due to "various causes," they describe these causes, and are equally specific in suggesting remedies. A chapter on reading is followed by an extensive reading list.

The intimacy and faithfulness of its detail make this book an invaluable guide to the many social workers who, called upon to supervise a child in a foster home without ever having lived with one, may be at a loss to know what to expect of him at the various stages of his development.

Its clear, direct style makes it accessible to the average foster mother, and it makes excellent material for group discussion.

Mrs. Gruenberg's brilliant book, "We, the Parents," is addressed, in many parts, to those who have already dabbled in education for parenthood, but who have developed a faith in the ability of "form" to make up for feeling. It disclaims the use of

patented principles and heralds the return of common sense as a companion to book-knowledge. It also throws the spotlight on the relationship between parent and child as the factor, preempting all others.

This book is as modern as the New Year and makes a bull's eye hit at those worries and problems that are peculiar to the parents and children of this age. It demonstrates that the principles of child care are a body of dynamic, growing knowledge, that cannot develop in a vacuum.

Because people must learn before they unlearn, and because some parts of this book are addressed to the relatively sophisticated, it would, in the opinion of this reviewer, furnish better material for foster-parent group discussion than for their individual reading.

The little book, "Let's Talk About Your Baby," written by Dr. Tenney, one of the country's well-known pediatricians, was originally published privately for his patients. It richly deserves its expanded circulation, because it is one of those "different" books whose charm justifies its difference. Deliberately light in tone and buoyant with humor to relax anxious new mothers, it contains clear, simple advice for getting the baby through his first year. Each chapter heads off with a few pertinent reflections from Baby, Himself. Its reading is good fun, among other things, for both foster parent and parent.

—MARION D. GUTMAN

Baltimore, Md.

Recent Additions to the Lending Library

Growing Out of Babyhood, W. S. and L. K. Sadler. Funk & Wagnalls, New York.

Handbook of American Institutions for Delinquent Juveniles, The Osborne Association, New York.

The Adolescent Court and Crime Prevention, J. G. Brill and E. G. Payne. Pitman Publishing Co. New York.

Scientific Social Surveys and Research, P. V. Young. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York.

Psychiatric Social Work, Lois Meredith French. The Commonwealth Fund, New York.

Child Psychology, Florence Teagarden. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York.

New Publication

CHILDREN IN EXILE, by Dr. Geraldine Pederson-Krag. Price, 25 cents.

"OUR Changing Basis of Intake Procedure," an address given at the Southern Regional Conference by Miss Ora Pendleton, of the Children's Bureau of Philadelphia, is now available in mimeographed form. Price, 25 cents.

1940

non
also
een
ers.
akes
hat
age.
re a
not

arn,
d to
nion
ster-
dual

by,"
well-
pri-
ex-
ffer-
ence.
umor
lear,
first
ment
good
and

AN
, Md.

unk &
s, The
E. G.
entice-
Com-
, Inc.,

erson-

" an
rence
eau of
aphed